

JUL 15 2008

Application No. 10/672,937
Amendment and Reply Dated July 15, 2008
In Response to Office Action Dated April 15, 2008

Amendments to the Claims

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

Listing of claims:

1. (Currently Amended) A method for ~~outputting variants between analyzing sample~~ sequence information relating to at least one sample ~~and reference sequence information relating to at least one reference~~, the method comprising:
acquiring sample sequence information relating to the at least one sample, the sample sequence information comprising a plurality of base calls;
assembling consensus sequence information from the sample sequence information;
generating rule-based criteria, the rule-based criteria comprising pre-selected rules for at least one of scan position differences, peak height ratios, peak area ratios, and base composition;
identifying ambiguous bases present within the consensus sequence information by comparing the consensus sequence information to the rule-based criteria, wherein bases that do not meet the pre-selected rules for at least one of the rule-based criteria are labeled ambiguous;
~~determining what percentage of the bases present within the consensus sequence information are ambiguous bases;~~
~~trimming the consensus sequence information until the percentage of ambiguous bases is below a user-defined threshold, to form trimmed consensus sequence information;~~
~~determining variant information between the trimmed consensus sequence information and the reference sequence information; and~~

Application No. 10/672,937
Amendment and Reply Dated July 15, 2008
In Response to Office Action Dated April 15, 2008

outputting the ~~variant information~~ ambiguous bases to a user.

2. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the generated rule-based criteria comprises pre-selected rules for scan position differences and the method further comprises identifying differences between scan positions of major and minor peaks, within the sample sequence information, which fall below an empirical threshold.
3. (Original) The method of claim 2, wherein the empirical threshold associated with identifying differences between scan positions is in the range of approximately 0 to approximately 3.
4. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the generated rule-based criteria comprises pre-selected rules for scan position differences and the method further comprises identifying differences between scan positions of major and minor peaks within the sample sequence information, which reside above, below, or are substantially equivalent to, a user-defined threshold.
5. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the generated rule-based criteria comprises pre-selected rules for peak height ratios and the method further comprises identifying differences between peak height ratios for major and minor peaks, within the sample sequence information, which exceed an empirical threshold.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

PAGE 06

JUL 15 2008

Application No. 10/672,937
Amendment and Reply Dated July 15, 2008
In Response to Office Action Dated April 15, 2008

6. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 5, wherein the empirical threshold associated with the peak height ratios is in the range of approximately 0.3 to approximately 1.0.
7. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the generated rule-based criteria comprises pre-selected rules for peak area ratios and the method further comprises identifying differences between peak area ratios of major and minor peaks, within the sample sequence information, which reside above, below, or are substantially equivalent to, a user-defined threshold.
8. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the generated rule-based criteria comprises pre-selected rules for peak area ratios and the method further comprises identifying differences between peak area ratios for major and minor peaks, within the sample sequence information, which exceed an empirical threshold.
9. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 8, wherein the empirical threshold associated with the peak area ratios is in the range of approximately 0.3 to approximately 1.0.
10. (Canceled).
11. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the generated rule-based criteria comprises pre-selected rules for base composition and the method further comprises determining

Application No. 10/672,937
Amendment and Reply Dated July 15, 2008
In Response to Office Action Dated April 15, 2008

major and minor peaks within the sample sequence information and determining if the major and minor peaks within the sample sequence information are both purines or both pyrimidines.

12-15. (Canceled).

16. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, further comprising:
excluding identified ambiguous bases from the sample sequence information and
assembling exclusionary consensus sequence information; and
determining variant sequence information between the exclusionary consensus sequence
information and the reference sequence information.

17. (Canceled)

18. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the sample sequence information
relating to the at least one sample and the reference sequence information relating to the at least one
reference comprise mitochondrial DNA sequence information.

19-44. (Canceled)

45. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the identifying ambiguous bases
further comprises assigning a quality value to those bases that have been identified as ambiguous.

Application No. 10/672,937
Amendment and Reply Dated July 15, 2008
In Response to Office Action Dated April 15, 2008

46. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, ~~wherein further comprising~~ trimming the consensus sequence information ~~comprises by~~ trimming the edges of the consensus sequence information.

47. (Canceled).